

Remarks/Arguments

This response is filed within two months after the July 18, 2007 Final Office Action. In the Final Office Action, claim 8, 9, 12 and 13 were rejected under section 103 as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Cooper (US Patent 3,991,832) and Truax et al (US Patent 4,206,580).

In this response, claim 8 is amended to specify each motor rotates a separate mower blade, and to specify the first pilot-operated directional control valve in response to the first pilot signal directs a flow of hydraulic fluid passing through the first hydraulic motor to pass through the second hydraulic motor, and the second pilot-operated directional control valve in response to the second pilot signal directs a flow of hydraulic fluid passing through the first hydraulic motor to pass through the third hydraulic motor.

Claim 9 is amended to specify first and second pilot-operated directional control valves that in response to the pilot signals direct the hydraulic fluid passing through the first hydraulic motor to pass through the second and third hydraulic motors in series without directing the flow through any other restrictive valves.

Claim 12 is amended to specify each pilot operated control valve directs hydraulic flow passing through the first motor to pass through one of the second and third hydraulic motors in the presence of a pilot signal associated with that motor without directing the hydraulic flow through any other restrictive valves, and prevents hydraulic flow from passing through the second or third hydraulic motor in the absence of the pilot signal.

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are patentable over the cited references.

Cooper's teachings cannot be applied to Applicant's admitted prior art, or the Truax reference. First, Cooper's teachings are specific to a hydraulic circuit that operates cylinders that lift, tilt or angle a dozer blade. Cooper is not directed to a hydraulic circuit for rotating mower blades. In contrast, Applicant's admitted prior art is directed to rotating three separate blades under mower decks. Truax is directed to a mower assembly with one blade.

Second, one would not apply Cooper's teachings to Applicant's admitted prior art because Cooper fails to teach a circuit where hydraulic fluid passes through several hydraulic motors at the same time. Instead, Cooper's hydraulic circuit has lift, tilt and angle cylinders which could not be operated at the same time. Cooper's cylinders could not be operated at the same time because hydraulic fluid does not

pass through from one cylinder to the next, except for pressure relief. For example, while Cooper's direction control valve 64 is open to operate lift cylinders 22, 24, Cooper's tilt cylinder 52 has only limited functionality. At that time, the functionality of Cooper's tilt cylinder is limited by the volume of hydraulic fluid displaced from the rod ends of the lift cylinders. Cooper's teachings are contrary to the present invention, and specifically to claims 8, 9 and 12 which include limitations specifying hydraulic fluid passes through from one motor to the next.

Truax's teachings cannot be applied to Applicant's admitted prior art or Cooper. That is because Truax fails to teach anything about passing hydraulic fluid through from one hydraulic motor to the next. Nor is Truax's actuator part of a hydraulic circuit with solenoid operated control valves. Instead, Truax's actuator 103 that rides on cam surfaces 32A, 32B to close second valve 102.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525.

Respectfully,

/SDellett, Reg. # 32,564/

Stephen D. Dellett

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Stephen D. Dellett
Reg. No. 32,564
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4232